

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 13 and 17 are amended.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Albertalli and Examiner Smits at the interview held February 10, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute the record of the interview.

In section 4 on page 3, the Office Action objects to claim 17. Claim 17 is amended according to the language agreed to during the interview. Applicants thank the Examiners for indicating that this Amendment overcomes the objection to claim 17, and respectfully request therefore that the objection be withdrawn.

In section 6 on pages 3-9, the Office Action rejects claims 1-9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corston et al. (hereinafter "Corston") in view of Mann et al. (hereinafter "Mann"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As indicated in the Interview Summary, Corston does not disclose context setting information according to the combinations as claimed in claims 1-25. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating in the Interview Summary that the Office Action intended to make this concession, and that any language in the Office Action giving a contrary appearance fails to represent the Examiner's position when preparing the Office Action.

As also agreed during the interview, all but one of the examples in Mann involve a unit of text relating to other text that appeared earlier, not "further along" as recited in claims 1-25. the sole exception appears on pages 49-50 of Mann where it was agreed that the phrase, "while attending Occidental College," precedes the phrase "he volunteered to work at the station as a classical music announcer." It was agreed that the phrase "while attending Occidental College" is not necessary to understand the meaning of the phrase "he volunteered to work at the station

as a classical music announcer." Rather, it was agreed that, as stated in Mann, this example is presented to differentiate an unrealized situation from a realized situation, and that a realized situation is far broader than a situation where a unit of text provides context setting information that is necessary to the meaning of information encoded further along in a text, as recited in claims 1-25.

Claims 1 and 13, from which claims 2-12 and 14-25 depend, are amended exactly as discussed at the interview. Applicants thank the Examiner for agreeing that these amendments overcome the rejections, as indicated in the Interview Summary form.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-9, 11 and 12 as being unpatentable over Corston in view of Mann be withdrawn.

In section 7 on pages 9-13, the Office Action rejects claims 10 and 13-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corston in view of Mann and further in view of Polanyi (*a formal model of the structure of discourse*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants thank the Examiners for clarifying that Polanyi is not relied upon with respect to the context setting information according to the combinations as claimed in claims 10 and 13-25. Applicants also thank the Examiner for clarifying that the concession at the bottom of page 10 in the Office Action is a concession that the combination of Corston and Mann teach a different method of building a tree than the combination as recited in claim 13.

Further, as previously stated, claims 1 and 13, from which claims 2-12 and 14-25 depend, are amended exactly as discussed at the interview. Applicants thank the Examiner for agreeing that these amendments overcome the rejections, as indicated in the Interview Summary form.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10 and 13-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-25 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/sqb

Date: February 15, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--